

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 12, 2008.

Claims 1 and 23 are amended, claims 6 and 28 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-5, 7-27 and 29-44 remain pending in this application.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiner Seng Lim and Examiner John Hotaling for the courtesy of an in-person interview on July 22, 2008 with Applicant's representatives Rodney Lacy and Michael Blankstein. Proposed amendments to the claims were discussed during the interview. Examiner Lim indicated that the proposed amendment overcame the art of record, however further search and consideration would be needed regarding the proposed amendment.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 23 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13 of copending Application No. 10/788,661 and 10/788,902. Applicant does not admit that the claims are obvious in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/788,902. However, Applicant will file a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(b)(iv) if necessary when all other issue regarding the patentability of the claims have been resolved.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-22, 23-24, 29 and 31-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Letovsky et al. (U.S. 2002/0147047 A1).

In general, independent claims 1 and 23 recite systems and methods that provide a three party handshake involving a discovery agent, a cashless gaming service and a wagering game client on a wagering game network. A cashless gaming service first sends service information to a discovery agent, the discovery agent authorizes and authenticates the service and in response publishes the service information. A client such as a wagering game machine desiring to use the

cashless gaming service obtains the service information from the discovery agent and uses the service information to contact the cashless gaming service. Both the independent and dependent claims recite other patentable distinctions. Applicant respectfully submits that when the claims are considered as a whole, the cited references do not teach or suggest the inventive subject matter recited in the claims.

In particular, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 23 consistent with the proposed amendments discussed during the interview of July 22, 2008. As noted above, during the interview, the Examiner indicated that the claimed invention as now recited in independent claims 1 and 23 distinguishes over Letovsky. Therefore Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 23. Applicant further respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2, 7, 9-22, 24, 29 and 31-43, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claims 1 and 23.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 3-5, 8, 25-27 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Letovsky et al. (U.S. 2002/0147047 A1). Claims 3-5 and 8 depend from claim 1 and claims 25-27 and 30 depend from claim 23. As noted above, during the personal interview of July 22, 2008, the Examiner indicated that the claimed invention as now recited in independent claims 1 and 23 distinguishes over Letovsky. Therefore Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 3-5, 8, 25-27 and 30, based at least on their respective dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claims 1 and 23.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action; however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. §

1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' representative at (612) 373-6954 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6954

Date August 12, 2008

By 
Rodney L. Lacy
Reg. No. 41,136

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 12 day of August, 2008.

Zhakalazky M. Carrion

Name

Signature